UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,642	01/03/2001	Paul J. Rank	0007056-0055	7532

58328   7590   03/21/2007

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
FOR SUN MICROSYSTEMS
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER
HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/756,642	RANK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Hillery	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 December 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>60-79</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>60-79</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 12/19/06.

2.   Claims 60 – 79 are pending in the case. Claims 60 and 70 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4.   Claims 60 – 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

5.   Specifically, the specification has no support for "retrieving the cell data" as recited in claims 60 and 70 and argued as patentably distinguishable from the prior art. On the other hand, the specification does have support for "extracting the cell data"; thus, for the purposes of this examination, "receiving the cell data" will be interpreted as "extracting the cell data". However, it should be noted that the rejection is not overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 60 – 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Richards (US 6292810 B1) and in further view of Horie et al. (US 6487597 B1).

8.   **Regarding independent claim 60**, Richards teaches that a series of decision

blocks are used to test the delete option index in combination with the from-cell address

compared to the outer edge of the sheet minus the offset of the cells (Column 82, lines

10 – 12), which meet the limitation of **determining whether cell data location**

information for a selected spreadsheet file cell is contained in a first grid record,

since **cell data location information** is equivalent to "the delete option index in

combination with the from-cell address" and "the outer edge of the sheet minus the

offset of the cells" is equivalent to **a first grid record**.

Richards teaches that in decision block 2879 the index of one indicates that cells

are being moved left for the selected range (Column 82, lines 12 and 13), which meet

the limitation of **if the cell data location information is contained in the first grid**

record, determining the cell data location information from the first grid record;

Richards teaches that the row value set by the row loop of decision block 2883 is

compared with the first and last row selected, R1 and R2, and the column as set by the

column loop of decision block 2855 is compared to the last column minus the column

offset (Column 82, lines 13 – 17), which meet the limitation of **determining the location**

of cell data corresponding to the spreadsheet file cell in a cell data record based

on the cell data location information;

Richards teaches that if the cell is located within this combined range, then the

cell is cleared and all of the cell contents and controls are deleted (Column 82, lines 17

– 19), which meet the limitation of **retrieving the cell data from the cell data record**.

Richards does not explicitly teach **the first grid record storing a mapping**

between a plurality of spreadsheet file cells and the location of their

corresponding cell data in a cell data record implemented in the record-based

computer readable-medium.

Horie et al. teach that FIG. 10 is a flow chart of the spreadsheet-processing

program that provides the step for determining the file size and the step for executing

the file-dividing program. That is, the program of the flowchart of FIG. 10 sequentially

executes the steps for storing in the transfer data area the data copied to the clipboard

(spreadsheet data), registering the first n characters of the data as a file name, sending

a data transmission initiate signal to the PDA, and transmitting the spreadsheet data

(Column 9, lines 10 – 24), which meet the limitation of **the first grid record storing a**

mapping between a plurality of spreadsheet file cells and the location of their

corresponding cell data in a cell data record implemented in the record-based

computer readable-medium. This limitation is further illustrated via Figs 19 and 21. Fig

19 is a selection of a spreadsheet file on a PC that is transferred to a PDA. Fig 21 is the

display of the transferred selection of the spreadsheet file of Fig 19 on the PDA.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the invention of Richards with that of Horie et al. because such a

combination would provide the users of Richards with the benefit of a way to transmit

only a desired portion of data in an information transmission apparatus (personal

computer or the like) in a simple operation to a personal digital assistant (Column 2,

lines 24 – 26).

9.   **Regarding dependent claim 61**, Richards teaches that some of the cells

processed will not be cleared, i.e., cells not on the outer edge. Therefore, a series of

decision blocks are used (Column 82, lines 7 – 10), which meet the limitation of **if the

cell data location information is not contained in the first grid record, determining

whether the cell data location information is contained in a second grid record**,

since "the outer edge" is equivalent to **a second grid record**

10.   **Regarding dependent claim 62**, Richards teaches that cell attribute is any

property, quality, or characteristic that can be ascribed to a cell (Column 19, lines 14

and 15), which meet the limitation of **determining from a property record property

information of the spreadsheet file**.

11.   **Regarding dependent claim 63**, Richards teaches that if the delete option index

is equal to two, then the column as set by the column loop of decision block 2855 is

compared to the first and last column of the selected range. If the cell is located within

this combined range, then the cell is cleared and all of the cell contents and controls are

deleted in process block (Column 82, lines 21 – 28), which meet the limitation of

determining whether cell data location information for a selected spreadsheet file

cell is contained in a first grid record includes comparing a column number of the spreadsheet file cell to a column value range of the first grid record.

12.   **Regarding dependent claim 64**, Richards teaches that if the delete option index is equal to two, then the column as set by the column loop of decision block 2855 is compared to the first and last column of the selected range. If the cell is located within this combined range, then the cell is cleared and all of the cell contents and controls are deleted in process block (Column 82, lines 21 – 28), which meet the limitation of **determining whether cell data location information for a selected spreadsheet file cell is contained in a first grid record includes comparing a column number of the spreadsheet file cell to a column value range of the second grid record.**

13.   **Regarding dependent claim 65**, Richards teaches that a series of decision blocks are used to test the delete option index in combination with the from-cell address compared to the outer edge of the sheet minus the offset of the cells (Column 82, lines 10 – 12), which meet the limitation of **the cell data location information indicates the location of cell data in the cell data record**, since **cell data location information** is equivalent to "the delete option index in combination with the from-cell address".

14.   **Regarding dependent claims 66 and 67**, Richards does not explicitly teach **the cell data location information is a 16 bit matrix** nor **the first 10 bits of the 16 bit**

matrix indicate the cell data record containing the cell data, and the last 6 bits of the 16 bit matrix indicated the location of the cell data within the cell data record.

Horie et al. teach that storing in the transfer data area the data copied to the clipboard (spreadsheet data), registering the first n characters of the data (for example, n=20) as a file name, sending a data transmission initiate signal to the PDA, transmitting the spreadsheet data (Column 9, lines 16 – 20), which meet the limitation of **the cell data location information is a 16 bit matrix and the first 10 bits of the 16 bit matrix indicate the cell data record containing the cell data, and the last 6 bits of the 16 bit matrix indicated the location of the cell data within the cell data record**, since a matrix is an array of rows and columns and Horie et al. further teach that FIG. 20B an example of a list of spreadsheets "after data transfer", in which a character string (for "maker") within the head cell (column A, row 1) in the selected range in FIG. 19 is additionally displayed as a title (Column 11, lines 20 – 24). Horie et al. discloses using "n" characters, which the skilled artisan would have been well aware could therefore be 16 bits.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Richards with that of Horie et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Richards with the benefit of a way to transmit only a desired portion of data in an information transmission apparatus (personal computer or the like) in a simple operation to a personal digital assistant (Column 2, lines 24 – 26).

15.   **Regarding dependent claim 68**, Richards teaches that the delete option index

is evaluated. In each case, the operation of FIG. 28G will be executed, however, the

parameters passed to that operation will vary depending upon the user's selection as

indicated by the delete option index. When the index is equal to a value of one in

decision block 2863, the execution block 2865 passes a zero value for the row offset

and the negative value of the column offset to the operation (Column 81, lines 40 – 47),

which meet the limitation of **the cell data location information indicates a value of**

zero if the spreadsheet file cell is empty.

16.   **Regarding dependent claim 69**, Richards does not explicitly teach **the data**

processing apparatus is a personal digital assistant.

        Horie et al. teach that storing in the transfer data area the data copied to the

clipboard (spreadsheet data), registering the first n characters of the data (for example,

n=20) as a file name, sending a data transmission initiate signal to the PDA, transmitting

the spreadsheet data (Column 9, lines 16 – 20), which meet the limitation of **the data**

processing apparatus is a personal digital assistant.

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the invention of Richards with that of Horie et al. because such a

combination would provide the users of Richards with the benefit of a way to transmit

only a desired portion of data in an information transmission apparatus (personal

computer or the like) in a simple operation to a personal digital assistant (Column 2,

lines 24 – 26).

17.   **Regarding claims 70 – 79**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject

matter as claims 60 – 69, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

18.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 60 – 79 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

19.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NH

Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100